

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re the Application of: Alexis Tzannes)	Group Art Unit: 2624
)	
Application No.: 10/611,950)	Examiner: ROSARIO, Dennis
)	
Filed: July 3, 2003)	Confirmation No.: 5413
)	
Atty. File No.: 5550-31)	
)	

For: ITERATIVE COMPRESSION PARAMETER CONTROL TECHNIQUE FOR IMAGES

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF
REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Appellants respectfully request the Board review the following arguments and return the application to the Examiner with a recommendation for an issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Despite the assertions in the Final Office Action, Appellants respectfully submit that Hou does not teach, suggest, or disclose wavelet transforms. The Final Office Action states “the Examiner respectfully disagrees, since Hou teaches that the claimed two-dimensional wavelet transform by teaching a “new MLT...[that]...encapsulates...the wavelet transforms” in col. 7, lines 30-37. Thus, the new MLT reasonable contains a wavelet transform to effectively produce the MLT and wavelet transforms. More specifically, Hou teaches in col. 9, lines 24-33 that the “MLT is a transform having a modulation function” in ibid where such function is renamed as “input data multiplication” in ibid wherein such “examples” in ibid are provided of which is the “wavelet...transform” in ibid. Thus, the new MLT is a transform of itself having the wavelet transform which is another transform. Thus, the 103(a) rejection is maintained.

Applicants state that the MLT is not a wavelet transform. The Examiner respectfully disagrees in light of the above paragraph. An MLT in general may not be a wavelet transform, but Hou's new MLT is the wavelet transform, because Hou uses the wavelet with the MLT."

Appellants respectfully submit the Office has misinterpreted the relied upon portion of the Hou reference.

In particular, Hou recites, *inter alia*,

The preferred MLT process and implementation obviates many of the artifacts that are introduced by some of the standard compression techniques. The new MLT reduces blocking artifacts and has excellent resistance to errors. This MLT technique encapsulates the favorable convolution feature of the wavelet transforms and produces images which, when compressed, for example, at ten to one, and decompressed, compare very favorably using error statistics, classification accuracy and visual quality metrics, to the original uncompressed input image, yet can transform block wise input data for fast computation. These and other advantages will become more apparent from the following detailed description of the preferred embodiment.

Based on the above, it is abundantly clear that what Hou is teaching is that the "MLT technique encapsulates the *favorable convolution feature* of the wavelet transforms and produces images which..." (Emphasis Added). Hou is not saying that the MLT technique includes the wavelet transform as asserted by the Office. Rather, Hou is stating that the results of the MLT technique produce the favorable convolution features of the wavelet transforms.

The MLT is not a wavelet transform. This is reinforced by the fact that nowhere in the Hou reference does Hou state that the MLT is a wavelet transform, nor includes a wavelet transform. In complete technical distinction, the MLT is a hybrid transform, and on column 3, beginning on line 53, Hou defines the MLT as:

The preferred MLT process and implementation obviates many of the artifacts that are introduced by some of the standard compression techniques. The new MLT reduces blocking artifacts and has excellent resistance to errors. This MLT technique encapsulates the favorable convolution feature of the wavelet transforms and produces images which, when compressed, for example, at ten to one, and decompressed, compare very favorably using error statistics, classification accuracy and visual quality metrics, to the original uncompressed input image, yet can transform block wise input data for fast computation. These and other advantages will become more apparent from the following detailed description of the preferred embodiment.

Clearly, Hou has developed a modulated lapped transform method that includes some favorable features from other transforms. However, as is abundantly clear from the definition of the MLT, and the relied upon portion of Hou, the MLT process is not, and does not include a wavelet transform.

In that the independent claims require the use of a two-dimensional wavelet transform, Appellants respectfully submit the independent claims are patentably distinguishable therefrom. In that the dependent claims contain additional feature(s), Appellants respectfully submit that all claims are clearly patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

An overturning of the outstanding rejection and passing of the case to issuance is respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to deposit account number 19-1970 any fees under 37 CFR § 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper and to credit any overpayment to that Account. If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this paper and has not been separately requested, such extension is hereby petitioned.

Respectfully submitted,

SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.

Date: 8 Mar '11

By: 

Jason H. Vick
Reg. No. 45,285
1560 Broadway, Suite 1200
Denver, Colorado 80202
Telephone: 303-863-9700